

Charles Holbrook Library
Pacific School of Religion
1798 Scenic Ave.
Berkeley, California.

Social Questions Bulletin

Page 49

APRIL, 1959

Number 4

How Fare Our Civil Freedoms?

The democratic liberties which are such a precious, distinctive part of our American heritage, stand or fall by the extent to which they are treasured and defended. The eternal vigilance required for their maintenance and extension, is vigilance not only of courts and officials, but of us all. Those of us who would defend our Bill of Rights, need an annual inventory, at least, of how those rights fare. Such is provided us by the recently issued American Civil Liberties Union annual report. The latest report ends officially as of June 30, but actually takes account of developments as late as October. Dick Murphy Malin, ACLU Executive Director, wrote the introduction. He takes note of the less repressive atmosphere than existed in the McCarthy era, yet observes:

"Men have once again this year been more successful in conquering outer space than in redeeming inner space: they have done better with satellites and trans-polar submarines than with themselves. And we who are especially concerned with American civil liberties should remind ourselves once again of how many other things people are interested in or affected by, often to the disregard or injury of those central Constitutional liberties of free speech, due process and equal protection."

"Anticipatory self-restraint still cuts the main nerve of academic freedom in schools and colleges. Many teachers in Southern institutions are running into bad external trouble when they express agreement with the Supreme Court. . . . The problem of 'establishment' is growing apace—especially in the Catholic desire for public subsidy of parochial schools (or the exemption of Catholic parents from public school taxation) and in the Protestant desire for public-school encouragement . . . of at least non-sectarian religious morality. . . . The internal democracy of unions has a long way to go in voluntary or governmental protection. The NAACP need not disclose its membership lists, and controversial political opinion has more scope; but the Supreme Court has yet to rule directly on the mandate of the House Un-American Activities Committee, or on the denial of passports for reasons of foreign policy. . . . There remain the frightening problems of wire tapping's indiscriminate invasion of privacy. . . . Applicants for government or defense-industry employment, rejected for alleged loyalty-and-security reasons, still have no adequate way of learning or contesting the allegations, which may jeopardize all their careers elsewhere. . . . The way in which administrative agencies, from the Tariff Commission to the FBI, use their delegated discretion needs penetrating and sustained examination, and the code of military justice in these days of a mass army of citizen-draftees, and civilian dependents living on military bases—needs it too. . . . Aliens are still subject to discriminatory federal standards for admission, and discriminatory State and municipal and private standards for employment; and against the American Indians the rest of us continue to commit the sin of acting without their consent, most recently in unilaterally moving to end organized tribal life. Negro Americans continue to represent our largest unfulfilled nationwide obligation, in the segregated housing of the North as well as in the segregated schooling, arbitrarily barred voting and other discrimination in the South."

In the domestic area, the report deals with: I. Free Belief Expression and Association; II. Equality before the Law; and III. Due Process under Law. In the first category attention is given to the general field of censorship, as directed against books, magazines, movies, and radio and TV—both by private groups and by government agencies, e.g., the Post Office.

ACLU has an increasing number of complaints that foreign periodicals bought through subscriptions were not being delivered. Court challenge continues frustrated by the Post Office Department's apparent policy of mooting the issue when sufficient protest has been generated. A recent example is the Chicago Council for American-Soviet Friendship. After adamantly maintaining it either did not censor solicited materials or that it did when the source of the material was not identified, the Post Office, on the verge of a court action to be brought by the ACLU, gave way and released the Council's incoming periodicals. A Long Beach, Cal., ordinance prohibited distribution of free literature on the streets by members of the Socialist Labor Party, although other regulations against distribution of political handbills in San Francisco and New York have been ruled unconstitutional. ACLU objected to bans against other leaflets in Chicago, Cleveland and Union, N. J.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, founded in 1907, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation stands for the complete abolition of war. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives, the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decisions, not by violence.

Movie censorship has declined markedly since 1952 when the Supreme Court ruled (in the *Miracle* case) that the Constitution's protection for free speech applied to movies. According to the *Harvard Law Review* some 20 localities censor films, whereas some 90 formerly did so. The action of civil libertarians vis-a-vis radio and TV has aimed at assuring diversity in viewpoints presented and preventing exclusion of minority positions. The Lancaster, Penn., ACLU Chapter, e.g., objected to FCC when station WGAL declined "programs of the independent United Electrical Workers Union."

One difficulty in assuring adequate public information is in extremes to which government officials and agencies resort in denying access to government documents.

The Freedom of Information Committee of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic fraternity, reported 93 cases of "needless secrecy" in Washington during the year ending November, 1957. Example was the Defense Department's action in finally conferring security clearance upon a book review by Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, III, of the revised edition of the memoirs of a Confederate Army general. . . . The State Department warned its intelligence officers not to tell reporters anything at all—not even the capital of Paraguay (Asuncion) because it might turn into a discussion of general policy.

President Eisenhower signed but his Cabinet virtually all opposed, a one-sentence bill precluding further use of officials of a 169-year-old "housekeeping of records" law to keep information from the public. Commerce Secretary Sawyer in a Cincinnati public speech complained the public gets too much information from the government, and: "If this nation should perish, it will be due, in part, to the fact our Bill of Rights has been overworked." The right of the public to know is involved in the press battle against our State Department over the question of free travel of journalists to China for news reporting.

The ACLU report deals with the area of academic freedom, noting that 32 states, plus D.C., require a loyalty oath of teachers. Twelve states "demand opposition to the Communist Party and its doctrines, 11 demand non-membership in 'sub-

(Continued on next page)

CALL TO 1959 MFSA NATIONAL MEETING

President Loyd F. Worley, based on affirmative response to his suggestion (published in the March SQB), calls all MFSA members and friends to meet in 1959 national convention, at ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI's YMCA, 1528 Locust Street, MAY 29-31. The meeting begins with registration at 10 a. m., May 29, closes with communion the afternoon of May 31. The Central Branch YWCA is at 1411 Locust Street. Hotels nearby are also available. YMCA rooms are \$2.50 to \$3 a night. Make room reservation requests early, and send your meeting reservation by return mail:

To: MFSA, Box 327, Gresham, Oregon

I know you need me at the 1959 meeting, May 29-31. I'm coming. My \$3 registration fee is enclosed. ☐ Send me more program details.

Signed: _____

Address _____

My program suggestions: _____

versive' groups." Mississippi, in an apparent effort to weed out of the teaching profession all NAACP supporters, requires each teacher to list all their organizational ties during the past five years, and all groups to which they contribute.

This reminds us that the constitutional guarantee of free assembly may well stand or fall with the related freedom of anonymity, a point reached by the U. S. Supreme Court in striking down Alabama's anti-NAACP compulsory membership disclosure law. Similar disclosure laws, directed against NAACP, were passed "in Texas (by one vote), Arkansas, Tennessee and Virginia," and almost passed in Florida and North Carolina.

Freedom of religious assembly and expression were involved in the California law requiring churches (along with veterans and others seeking tax exemption) to sign non-disloyalty oaths regularly pleading they do not advocate the government's overthrow and will not oppose the government's future wars. The Methodists in California in annual conference voted opposition to the law and moral support to churches not signing the required oath. The First Methodist Church of San Leandro, Calif., refused to sign and went to court, as did the First Unitarian and Valley Unitarian-Universalist Churches of Los Angeles. The case of the Unitarian churches went all the way to the Supreme Court, which by a 7-1 decision ended California enforcement of the law by putting on the State the burden of proving any non-signing church actually advocates forcible, violent overthrow of government. (Chief Justice Warren abstained, since he had been Governor of California when the disputed measure had become law.)

Extension of religious freedom was involved in a ruling of D.C.'s Court of Appeals giving "tax exemption to the Washington Ethical Society as a religious organization though the Society does not teach or believe in a Supreme Being." Similar action was taken by the State District Court of Appeals in San Francisco on behalf of the non-theist Fellowship of Humanity—overturning the Alameda County assessor's denial of tax exemption on creedal grounds. Freedom for the humanitarian, though non-theist, conscience was also upheld by a Federal District Judge in Michigan who granted conscientious objector status to a University of Michigan student, Peter Horst, on the latter's simple assertion that he loved his fellow man and that he would rather spend five years in jail as a draft dodger than deny that love for every man, including an enemy. Maryland Univ. student Kenneth Hanauer has not fared so well, the Maryland Court of Appeals upholding the University's right to bar Hanauer "unless he agreed to take an ROTC course." He is appealing to the Supreme Court.

Tensions over the moral and social issue of racial segregation have brought loss of jobs to numerous teachers in the South who in conscience voiced support for Supreme Court or law observance, or who were believed integration supporters. In the University of Mississippi in recent years, "31 of 136 teachers have resigned, most of them over pressure from legislators to weed out hidden supporters of integration. A Maryland teacher was forced to resign because he told his junior high school students he was "ashamed" of police brutality against Negroes in Georgia." For advocating obedience to the U. S. Supreme Court decision a Texas Technological College teacher lost his job, as did an Alabama Polytechnic Institute teacher for publicly favoring "proposals to widen school integration in N. Y. City."

In contravention of the Constitution's guarantee of free expression and assembly, the State Department in recent years has penalized political dissent by denying dissenters passports. Last June the Supreme Court dealt a potent blow against that restrictive State Department practice and on behalf of the freedom of travel promised in the Declaration of Human Rights adopted over ten years ago by the United Nations with U. S. government support. The Supreme Court ordered the State Department to grant passports to artist Rockwell Kent, Los Angeles psychiatrist Walter Briehl and physicist Weldon Bruce Dayton:

Citizens who have neither been accused of crimes nor found guilty. They are being denied their freedom of movement solely because of their refusal to be subjected to inquiry into their beliefs and associations. . . . Freedom of movement (of which the citizen cannot be deprived without the due process of law of the Fifth Amendment) was

part of our heritage. Travel abroad, like travel within the country may be necessary for a livelihood. It may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, or wears, or reads.

That important Court decision, however, did not clear affirm one's constitutional right to free travel, nor prohibit government interference with it. It held that the State Department had no authority from Congress to prohibit travel on the grounds of the applicant's political beliefs and associations. Subsequent to that decision, Congress has received both an anti-liberal administration measure and a liberal Humphrey bill of passport and travel rights. Final victory for free travel for Americans, is not yet won.

Numerous civil liberty issues have concerned witnesses before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and similar Senate Committee and state committees. The free-hand witch-hunting of these committees, has met with some setback from the courts, but not yet a clear judicial declaration of unconstitutionality. Persons still lose their jobs when called before such committees or when refusing to answer improper committee questions as to belief or association—supposed, under our Constitution, to be free from governmental restraint. The Supreme Court's Watkins decision is still the main decision in this area, no subsequent decisions having yet gone beyond it, or developed it further. Last August the U. S. Court of Appeals, e.g., reversed the lower court's contempt conviction of Arthur Miller for having refused to answer certain questions of the House un-Americans; but the reversal was not on the ground that the questions were illegitimate, but that Miller was not adequately informed of the possible penalty for non-answer. How slow the courts are in getting at the centrally important constitutional issues! And despite the setback to the House Committee inherent in the Supreme Court's Watkins decision that Committee continues to get the large appropriations requested for its continuing and now long-standing forays against first amendment freedoms: speech, press, religion, peaceful assembly.

One of the true bright spots in this area of free expression and assembly, lies in the Smith Act cases. Though the Supreme Court did not quite say, as we could have hoped, that the prescription of verbal advocacy in the Smith Act was per se unconstitutional, its former Smith Act decisions have so narrowly permissible implementation of that undemocratic measure, as to render it largely ineffective.

Convictions of Communist Party leaders under the Smith Act, which once numbered 114, are rapidly being reversed and further prosecutions dropped as result of the June, 1957, Supreme Court decision in California Smith Act cases. The court ordered new trials for nine defendants (subsequently released) and freed five others on the ground the sole evidence against them was they were members of the Party and that, by itself, "makes no case against them." On the basis of the court's decision that advocacy, unrelated to any call for action, was illegal, new trials pend for 13 Communists in Colorado and Ohio. Smith Act charges against 41 Party leaders have been dropped at appellate courts ordered new trials in Michigan, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington State, Connecticut and Hawaii. In Puerto Rico and Boston, indictments were dropped before trials began in the cases of 18 other Party figures.

Thus there are considerably fewer Smith Act cases today in the courts than a few years ago, and also fewer passport cases, Army discharge, Attorney General's listing, state sedition, a Fifth Amendment privilege cases. And there are no more patriation, California tax oath, or loyalty-oath-in-public-housing projects cases.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year

25c per copy

Issued monthly, October through May, and one summer issue.

METHODIST FEDERATION for SOCIAL ACTION
An unofficial fellowship founded in 1907.

President, Dr. Loyd F. Worley; Vice-Presidents, Rev. Frederick E. Ball, Rev. Lee H. Ball, Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson, Rev. Elwin E. Wilson; Recording Secretaries, Mrs. Ella Mulkey, Miss Janice Roberts; Treasurer, Rev. Edward L. Peet.

Membership and West Coast Field Secretary, Rev. Mark A. Chamberlain

Editor, "Social Questions Bulletin," Rev. Jack R. McMichael

Editorial Office and Office of Publication

P. O. Box 327, Gresham, Oregon.

Re-entered as second class matter Sept. 15, 1953, at the Postoffice Gresham, Oregon, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

all this is noted by the fact-filled **Civil Liberties Docket** of the National Lawyers Guild (Vol. IV, No. 1—Nov., 1958), which sets out that there are, nonetheless, almost exactly the same number of court cases in the U. S. today involving First Amendment Rights, as was true when the **Docket** put out its first issue in 1955: 159 today and 161 then. The explanation is:

Four categories of cases show increased activity. There are, more cases involving **PACIFISTS**. There are almost twice as many **FIRST AMENDMENT REFUSALS** to answer political questions asked by legislative committees. There were no cases in 1955 against the N.A.A.C.P. Today there are 16 cases in five states. In 1955, there were two loyalty-security **DISMISSALS IN PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT** being tested (vs. today's) 24 such cases, including eight suits against unions charged with dismissals or refusal to process grievances. Justice seems a slow process. Forty-nine of the 161 First Amendment cases pending in Fall, 1955, are still pending in Fall, 1958.

We note also 56 public school desegregation cases today, whereas in 1955 there were 12 cases to get the Supreme Court decision implemented in public schools.

We seek an America of untrammelled equality and freedom: in which no person will know discrimination or separation because of his race or origin or faith; in which each of us can speak his mind, exercise freely his conscience, and join with his fellows courageously to implement his convictions. For us in this great unfinished land, equality and freedom are both heritage and dream, achievement and unfinished task. Grateful for the great bequest of our fathers and for current conquests, let us have a renewed heart and vigor join the battles which still must be waged and won today and tomorrow. We look at the past not for knowledge alone, but for knowledge with which to fight more effectively this day and the next. The past, as the ACLU report suggests, is but prologue to the present and the future.

J.R.M.

MOST IMPORTANT THING IN OUR WORLD TODAY*

By DR. LINUS PAULING

The most important thing in the world today is not a material object. It is a meeting, a conference of a few men in Geneva.

Last summer an important conference was held in Geneva. It was the First Geneva Conference on the Testing of Nuclear Bombs. It was a scientific conference, where scientists officially representing the governments of several nations discussed the question of whether it was possible for an international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs to be secretly violated. The conclusion that was reached was that a system of 180 inspection stations, under international control, would have sufficient probability of detecting any significant secret test of a nuclear weapon to prevent any nation from trying to carry out tests secretly.

One of the leaders at this conference was a Pasadena, Prof. Herbert Bacher, who is chairman of the Division of Physics, Mathematics, and Astronomy of the California Institute of Technology, and who was for three years an atomic energy Commissioner.

The second bomb test conference has now been going on in Geneva since October 31. Representatives of the United States, the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain are meeting there, day after day, in an effort to formulate an agreement about stopping the tests of nuclear weapons that will be acceptable by the three present nuclear powers, and also, it is hoped, will be signed by the other nations of the world, in the course of time. This agreement will, of course, include the system of inspection stations recommended by Professor Bacher and his associates at the first Geneva Conference.

The second Geneva Conference is the most important activity in the world today. If the negotiators are successful in formulating a satisfactory agreement, and if the agreement is signed by the three nuclear powers, we may hope that further conferences will be held, leading to more international agreements about the control of nuclear weapons. It is only through such conferences and international agreements that nuclear war can be averted. There is danger that a nuclear war will break out, and that if it does, the United States of America, will be destroyed. It

is small consolation to me to think that Russia, also, would be destroyed, if a nuclear war were to break out.

Two years ago Gen. Lauris Norstad, NATO commander, said "The United States has the power to inflict absolute destruction upon Russia." We know also that Russia has the power to inflict absolute destruction upon the United States, and that if a great war were to take place both nations would be destroyed, and most of their people killed.

At the present time some of the attacking bombers would be shot down, both over Russia and over the United States. But enough of them would get through to devastate both countries. I have calculated that 300 superbombs, exploded over the United States, would kill everybody in the country. A similar number would kill everybody in the U.S.S.R. Thousands of these terrible weapons are ready for use, in the stockpiles of the three nuclear powers.

Last week President Eisenhower said that we are not going to fight a ground war in Europe. The danger to us and to our nation is that, unless agreements about the control of nuclear weapons are made in time, international tension such as that over Berlin will lead to a nuclear war that will bring death to all of us.

* * *

Two weeks ago I wrote to Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, who is our chief negotiator in the Geneva conference that is now going on. In my letter I said, "My own opinion is that there is no activity in the world today that exceeds in importance the effort toward the formulation and execution of an international agreement about nuclear weapons on which you are now working. The making of a significant agreement, as the first in a series of great agreements about control of nuclear weapons and of other methods of waging war and the replacement of force by international law as the means of solving disputes between nations, may well in the future be considered to be one of the most important events in the history of the world. I believe that it is most important that the agreement on which you are working be formulated with extreme care, so that it cannot be subjected to just attack and that it will remain operative forever. I am not discouraged that four months of negotiation has not yet led to a final agreement. A very long period of careful study and negotiation might well be required before the agreement has been satisfactorily formulated."

In his answer to me, Ambassador Wadsworth said: "It is certainly the hope of our delegation here that an agreement can be reached that will mean the discontinuance of the nuclear weapons tests."

* * *

So long as the negotiations continue in Geneva, we may have hope that our nation will not be destroyed, along with much of the rest of the world. So long as these negotiations continue, we may have hope that we and our children and all our fellow Americans will not be killed by nuclear blast and fire and radioactivity. Ambassador Wadsworth and his associates in Geneva deserve the support of all of us. They are working to save us all.

The work that they are doing is the most important thing in the world today.

* Guest Editorial by Nobel Prize winner scientist, Dr. Pauling, in Pasadena **Independent Star-News**.

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

Among the recent headlines dealing with internal affairs, the ones that hold the most far reaching consequences are those which call attention to the American Bar Association's approval of the report of its Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives concerning Supreme Court decisions in that field. These consequences follow from the support this action gives the forces bent on repressing ideas and setting limits to the judgments of conscience.

Half the ten members of the Committee which produced the report are nationally known red hunters whose standing in that pursuit has been lowered by the Supreme Court decisions they attack. Several others come from the area where school integration has recently been hysterically labelled a communist con-

spiracy. The report is a 50-page document which surrounds its recommendations concerning the Supreme Court with a wandering tour over our foreign policy in quotations running back to 1913. When the Board of Governors sent it to the House of Delegates with their approval they added "this does not constitute endorsement of the report itself." The adoption was without approval of all the language. A few liberals tried in vain to get time to read the 50 pages and find out what they were voting for. They did succeed in striking out a phrase which referred to Supreme Court interpretations of the Bill of Rights as "technicalities."

The recommendations that made the headlines were not merely an attack upon the Supreme Court. They are designed to weaken and nullify the Bill of Rights. This purpose was covered up by a pious introductory declaration about the duty of the bar to defend the Supreme Court and an independent judiciary, as the guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedoms, from unfair and unjust attacks. Then the Committee proceeded to make proposals for legislation and executive action designed to reverse decisions of the Court which removed infringements of the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

The Committee then further concealed its basic purpose by the reason it gave for its objection to these Court decisions. The intent of the Court plainly was to apply to the situations under consideration the guarantees of the Bill of Rights. Consequently any judgment of the right or wrong of these decisions must stand upon the ground. Instead of so doing the Committee recommendations are based on alleged consequences: "internal security is weakened;" "encouraged an increase in communist activities!" opened a way by which subversives will be "freed to go forth and further undermine our nation." In view of the fact that the communist movement in this country was never so weak as it is now, the Committee reasoning is as ridiculous as its intent is evil.

That the basic purpose of the Committee was to limit the democratic freedoms put into our Constitution by the Bill of Rights is demonstrated by the nature of its proposals for legislation and executive action. They are: restore to the states the power to penalize sedition against the national government; extend the Smith Act by redefining "organize" and enlarging the definition of "advocacy;" extend the Federal employee security program to non-sensitive jobs; restore to the State Department authority to withhold passports and the rights to base such action on confidential information; require the deportation of aliens who were communists when they came here or became communists at any time thereafter." The record shows conclusively that all these procedures were used to deprive persons and organizations of what the Supreme Court decided were their constitutional rights. Among those thus deprived were ministers of religion and religious organizations. This record would inevitably continue if the Supreme Court's decisions are reversed.

These consequences are made clear beyond dispute in the final recommendation of the Bar Association report regarding the inquisitorial Congressional Committees whose records are studded with unconstitutional injustice. This last word calls for continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security (Eastland) Sub-Committee, and gives them both blanket approval for "great service to the nation."

The Bar Association speaks for 94,000 of the 230,000 lawyers across the country. Its top leadership is from the big business lawyers of the large industrial cities. Not all of these will go along with its present attitude toward the Bill of Rights. Some work with the American Civil Liberties Union which holds that the Un-American Activities Committee has no constitutional right to exist because its mandate violates the First Amendment by authorizing it to investigate propaganda. Also in several industrial cities there are top lawyers who were assigned by the court to defend communists unable to pay an attorney and in so doing made masterly use of the Bill of Rights.

It is already apparent that the Association membership is not going to tamely follow the recent action of the House of

Delegates. After heated debate the Philadelphia Association voted 288 to 183 for a resolution affirming faith in the Supreme Court "in its traditional role as interpreter of the Constitution." A few days later the New York City Bar Association unanimously passed a resolution calling on all members of the bar to sustain the Supreme Court independence as the keynote of an independent judiciary and its authority to interpret the Constitution and the laws of the United States. In such discussions and actions the great majority of the lawyers across the land whose work does not bring them in contact with the Bill of Rights, will get some education.

In Congress, where lawyers are the biggest vocational group, the prestige of the Bar Association is already being used effectively by those who consider it more important to convict communists than to maintain the Bill of Rights. Immediately after the Association's action, Eastland introduced seven bills embodying its recommendations. In the House Walter put through without debate, under a unanimous consent rule which allowed one man's objection to hold it up for a later date, a bill changing the meaning of the word "organize" in the Smith Act to cover practically every activity necessary to keep the Communist Party going. A few days later, a Judiciary sub-committee approved a Bill to reverse the Supreme Court decision about seditious laws. Anti-Supreme Court speeches and articles are being put into the Congressional record, with occasional replies.

This is another step in the subversion of our democratic freedoms which has been going on in Congress ever since the cold war repression started. Congress has permitted its inquisitorial committees to usurp the power to impose extra legal penalties upon political dissenters. It has given them the authority and the money to injuriously and falsely slander persons and organizations in their publications without a hearing or an attempt to find out the facts. As the dissenting judge in our struggle against the government pointed out these are moves toward the assumption of absolute power by the legislative branch of the government which the English people had once to undo.

The vital question of the preservation and enforcement of the Bill of Rights has brought the professions that help make public opinion to a day of judgment. What part the legal profession will finally play depends largely upon the position taken by the forces of education and religion. The immediate responsibility of organized religion is the education of its membership on this issue. Then the expression of its position to congressmen and senators by localities, and to Congress as a whole by petitions and resolutions.

To nine Negro bishops interviewing him about the brutal attacks upon their people in certain states in connection with their attempts to get their rights in transportation, education and at the polls, Senator Johnson is reported to have said: "When you people come here wanting something you need to bring up your troops." Political leaders faced with a demand naturally want to know how many are backing you. Religious leaders have spoken out on the Bill of Rights issue with clearness and force. What is needed now is support for them in petitions and resolutions.

H.F.W.

OUR READERS WRITE

Dear Loyd:

I send you warm appreciation for your clear and complete report to the Annual Meeting. How I wish I might have been there! I appreciate the Federation standing firm. You and the other officers should take real satisfaction in the continuing witness to the cause of social justice even though there is not a large membership. When an issue of crisis proportions arises you will always have the loyal-backing of those who are socially concerned—though they are not out on the frontier crusade continuously. A personal social action note: I spearheaded a campaign here successful in defeating Bingo on a local option basis in our town. Others said "It couldn't be done"—and it has in many N. Y. State communities. But by working together in four Protestant Churches, we did!

REV. ROBT. B. THOMAS, Cobleskill, New York.